

## MEETING NOTES

**MEETING DATE:** 02/04/21

**ATTENDEES:** Rebecca Turner, Barbara Kalish, Mary Hafferty/DOT Cultural Resources Specialist [Mary.Hafferty@dot.state.ma.us](mailto:Mary.Hafferty@dot.state.ma.us)

**DISTRIBUTION:** Attendees, Stephen Piersanti, Abigail Rogers-McKee, Douglas Cooper, File

**LOCATION:** Zoom Video Meeting

**SUBJECT:** RTE 23 Lighting Design and previous EHC comments

Item	Discussion	Action By/Date
1.	<b>Purpose of the meeting:</b>	
a.	Clarify roles and responsibilities with respect to EHC, DOT Cultural Affairs and Mass Historical	
b.	Establish a viable schedule for review and comment	
c.	Review EHC and DOT/CA comments	
2.	<b>Lighting Design Review</b>	
a.	<u>EHC comments</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Only 1 option for the pole light;</li><li>Lighting design by the light pole vendor rather than a professional consultant It was EHC's understanding that the design would be done by a Jacobs Engineering in-house professional lighting consultant;</li><li>DOT/Jacobs to provide design criteria and rationale;</li><li>DOT/Jacobs to provide fixture photometrics;</li><li>DOT/Jacobs to provide roadway light level plan;</li><li>DOT/Jacobs to demonstrate that the fixture has a high cut-off and will not spill light into the night sky and into windows of adjacent homes;</li><li>Pole Height: Proposed pole is 22'-4". This appears very high and makes the fixture a visual focal point and may conflict with trees and surrounding building facades. Taunton was the prototype. EHC considers this an inappropriate prototype because Taunton is a city with a sizeable commercial main street and taller brick/masonry buildings. Egremont is a village with mostly 1-2 story residential buildings with some commercial functions on the ground floor. The light fixtures would dominate the Egremont main street;</li><li>Visual Clutter: Egremont main street currently has many power/utility poles. Additional poles would add to the visual clutter. EHC would prefer a "low key" light pole with a shielded light source;</li><li>Design era: Egremont is an early New England colonial town, the light posts appear more Victorian in design. Simpler and more in keeping with the colonial architecture should be an option;</li><li>Quantity of poles: 40 poles shown in the DOT/Jacobs design. EHC questions the need for so much lighting given the amount of traffic and pedestrians between 5pm and 5am. Villages tend to install light posts at intersections, crosswalks and perhaps areas of significant danger such as sharp curves (design shows no fixtures at the curve). Currently there are approx. 7-8 light posts in town.</li><li>Existing cobra heads: it is EHC's understanding that these would be removed. Approval would be contingent upon this removal since multiple styles, sources and redundancies would be cacophonous;</li><li>Light source: It is EHC's understanding that the light source would be 3000k LED. Approval would be contingent upon compliance with this;</li><li>Traffic calming: DOT/Jacobs to explain why adding so much light would be traffic calming. Firstly, the major traffic volume is during daylight hours, secondly – well-lit roadways tend to encourage drivers to speed up not slow down;</li><li>Mixing light poles: the combination of the 22'-4" pendant head and a single globe light appear inconsistent and out of context. DOT/Jacobs to explain the rationale and provide renderings to support this design decision;</li></ol>	
3.	<b>Other Design Comments previously submitted</b>	
a.	<u>Sidewalk:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>EHC has requested that the sidewalk not look like a ribbon of concrete cutting through the town properties but have some color, texture and/or relevancy. Perhaps existing marble slabs could be incorporated at significant junctures and as chips in the concrete matrix. Colored concrete is an option if EHC can be assured that future cutting and patching would restore the sidewalk to its</li></ol>	

	original design; 2. Quality assurance: DOT/Jacobs to provide for design and control samples for approval by Egremont and EHC before completing concrete pours in the Specifications;	
4.	<b>Guard rails:</b> DOT/CR will explore the possibility of painting the metal guardrails. DOT/Jacobs to provide options that would be contextual or explain why there are no options to the galvanized/sst rails presented in the documents;	
5.	<b>Median strip</b> at 41 and Creamery – It is EHC's understanding that this will be Belgian block/Bluestone	
6.	<b>Crosswalks</b> 1. Stamped and colored concrete to mimic brick. 2. Quality assurance: DOT/Jacobs to provide for design and control samples for approval by Egremont and EHC before commencing work and completing concrete pours in the Specifications;	
7.	<b>Village School:</b> new steps have been added to the project scope. Handrail design 1. DOT/Jacobs to provide and present a contextual design for the handrail	
8.	<b>Landscape Design Review:</b> currently under review by DOT/Landscape unit. Comments will be forthcoming and shared with EHC;	
9.	<b>Communication protocol</b> All documents to MHC should have been routed through DOT/CR	
10.	<b>DOT/CR</b> has reviewed EHC comments and is supportive. EHC has been assured that approval of the project cannot proceed with EHC approval and satisfaction;	
11.	<b>Next Steps</b>	
a.	EHC to hold submission of comments until we are directed by DOT/CR	
b.	EHC will meet on Thur. 3/18 to discuss our design comments but make no formal submission until we have heard from DOT/CR.	